

**REMARKS**

The Office Action presents a Restriction Requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121, requiring Applicant to elect for substantive examination the invention of one of two groups allegedly present in the application as filed. In particular, the Office Action identifies the following groups of claims:

Group I, claims 1-9, and

Group II, claims 10-17.

In response to these requirements, **Applicant hereby elects for examination Group I (claims 1-9)** with traverse. Examination on the merits is requested.

Notwithstanding the above election, Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be reconsidered. The Office Action states that Groups I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice, but that the groups are distinct because the method can be practiced with a substantially different device.

Applicant submits that a combined search and examination of Groups I and II would not pose a serious burden to the Office. See MPEP §§ 803 and 808.02. The Office Action asserts that the inventions identified by these groups are distinct and have acquired a separate status in the art. In accordance with MPEP § 803, restriction is appropriate only when the groups are shown to be distinct and when there would be a “serious burden” placed on the Examiner to examine the claims without restriction. “If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.” MPEP § 803 (emphasis added). Each group of claims in the present application relate generally to providing orthogonal redundancy in sedation and analgesia systems. Therefore, the allegedly distinct groups asserted in the Office Action would nonetheless require the Examiner to search the same subclasses and consider the same prior art references. Consequently, Applicant maintains that the examination of all of the pending claims together will not place a serious burden upon the Examiner.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner examine the application upon the merits, and that the above remarks be fully considered in conjunction therewith. Timely allowance of all currently pending claims and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant has filed this Response and Amendment without increasing the number of claims above the number previously submitted or paid for. Accordingly, no additional claims fees are believed to be due at the present time. If such fees or any other fees associated with the filing of this paper are due at this time, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1349. Also, please credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1349.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative via telephone if such would expedite prosecution of this application toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 13, 2006

**HOGAN & HARTSON LLP**

555 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202-637-5600

Facsimile: 202-637-5910

By: Thomas W. Edman  
Celine Jimenez Crowson  
Registration No. 40,357

Thomas W. Edman  
Registration No. 51,643

**Customer No. 24633**